

**REMARK**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated July 3, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1 and 15 are hereby amended; claim 11 is currently cancelled; and claims 14 and 28 are withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, claims 1-10 and 12-30 are currently being examined. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-12 and 15-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by JP 2002-258299 (hereinafter “JP’299”); claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,387,330 to Bova et al. (hereinafter “Bova”); claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,344,768 to Parker et al. (hereinafter “Parker”); claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by WO 02/40165 (see U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0020942) to Ingenhoven et al. (hereinafter “Ingenhoven”); claims 1-13 and 15-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s Related Art (ARA) in view of JP 2002-258299; and claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2002-258299 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,540,104 to Yanagita et al. (hereinafter “Yanagita”).

The rejection of claims 1-12 and 15-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by JP’299 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable in that it recites “at least one dispensing unit to supply a dispensing material on the substrate, the dispensing unit corresponding to a row of the matrix array of the image display portions” and “a plurality of syringes mounted on each dispensing unit, wherein the number of the syringes in the dispensing unit corresponds to the number of image display portions in a row of the matrix array and each syringe dispenses the dispensing material along the peripheral region of the corresponding image display portion.” JP’299 does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

In Office Action, the Examiner stated “With respect claim 10-11, in JP’299 the image display portions are disposed as an array of image display portions on the substrate, and wherein the number of the syringes (10) provided on each one of the dispensing units are corresponding to the number of image display portions formed in a row of the array of image display portions.” Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s statement. JP’299 merely discloses “if the adjustment [ pitch / a dropping pitch and / between a panel 20 and 21 ] of a design is taken even when the panels (7.8 molds, 13 molds) 20 and 21 which have two or more patterns in one substrate 3 are designed, as shown in Fig. 5, it becomes producible [ the panel of the plurality / coincidence / in one equipment ] by the size of a syringe, and control of a number, and reduction of a production loss can be aimed at.” See, paragraph [0032]. That is, in JP’299, a plurality of syringes are operated to dispense the liquid crystal material onto only one panel, and the number of the syringes and the pitch between the syringes are controlled to dispense the liquid crystal material onto the panel having different size. Thus, JP’299 does not teach or suggest the technical features of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, and its dependent claims 2-10 and 12, are allowable over JP’299.

Claim 15 is allowable in that it recites “a plurality of dispensing units to contain a material to be dispensed, wherein the dispensing unit corresponds to a row of the matrix array of the image display portions” and “a plurality of syringes to receive the material to be dispensed from the dispensing units and to supply the material to a substrate, at least two of the syringes mounted on each one of the dispensing units and each syringe dispensing the dispensing material along the peripheral region of the corresponding image display portion.” JP’299 does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 15 for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants’ arguments with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 15, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15, and its dependent claims 16-26, are allowable over JP’299 for the same reasons given for claim 1 above.

The rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bova is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable in that it recites “at least one dispensing unit to supply a dispensing material on the substrate, the dispensing unit corresponding to a row of the matrix array of the image display portions” and “a plurality of syringes mounted on each dispensing unit, wherein the number of the syringes in the dispensing unit corresponds to the number of image display portions in a row of the matrix array and each syringe dispenses the dispensing material along the peripheral region of the corresponding image display portion.” Bova does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-10 and 12, are allowable over Bova.

The rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parker is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable in that it recites “at least one dispensing unit to supply a dispensing material on the substrate, the dispensing unit corresponding to a row of the matrix array of the image display portions” and “a plurality of syringes mounted on each dispensing unit, wherein the number of the syringes in the dispensing unit corresponds to the number of image display portions in a row of the matrix array and each syringe dispenses the dispensing material along the peripheral region of the corresponding image display portion.” Parker does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-10 and 12-13, are allowable over Parker.

The rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ingenhoven is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable in that it recites “at least one dispensing unit to supply a dispensing material on the substrate, the dispensing unit corresponding to a row of the matrix array of the image display portions” and “a plurality of syringes mounted on each dispensing unit, wherein the number of the syringes in the dispensing unit corresponds to the number of image display portions in a row of the matrix array and each syringe dispenses the dispensing material

along the peripheral region of the corresponding image display portion.” Ingenhoven does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-10 and 12, are allowable over Parker.

The rejection of claims 1-13 and 15-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s admitted art in view of JP’299 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable in that it recites “at least one dispensing unit to supply a dispensing material on the substrate, the dispensing unit corresponding to a row of the matrix array of the image display portions” and “a plurality of syringes mounted on each dispensing unit, wherein the number of the syringes in the dispensing unit corresponds to the number of image display portions in a row of the matrix array and each syringe dispenses the dispensing material along the peripheral region of the corresponding image display portion.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that ARA “discloses all the claimed elements except a plurality syringes or at least two of syringes mounted on each one of the dispense unit.” See Office Action, page 10, lines 12-13. The Examiner cites JP’299 as allegedly teaching “a plurality of syringes mounted on a dispensing unit.” See Office Action, page 10, line 14. As motivation for modifying the deficiency of the ARA with JP’299, the Examiner states, “It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of syringes in the admitted art to facilitate the formation of seal pattern.”

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s statement. As applicants stated to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by JP’299, JP’299 fails to teach or suggest the technical features of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, and its dependent claims 2-10 and 12-13, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 15 is allowable in that it recites “a plurality of dispensing units to contain a material to be dispensed, wherein the dispensing unit corresponds to a row of the matrix array of the image display portions” and “a plurality of syringes to receive the material to be dispensed from the dispensing units and to supply the material to a substrate, at least two of the syringes mounted on each one of the dispensing units and each syringe dispensing the dispensing material along the peripheral region of the corresponding image display portion.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 15 for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants’ arguments with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 15, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim claims 15, and its dependent claims 16-27, are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons given for claim 1 above.

The rejection of claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP’299 and further in view of Yanagita is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 29 and 30 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 15, which is allowable.


Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496.7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: **3 October 2007**

Respectfully submitted,

By   
**Eric J. Nuss**

Registration No. **40,106**  
McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP  
1900 K St. NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel: 202.496.7500  
Attorney for Applicants